

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 18, 2006 the Examiner noted that claims 1, 3-11, 13-26 and 28-36 were pending, and rejected claims 1, 3-11, 13-26 and 28-36. Claims 1, 9, 11, 23, 26, 34 and 36 have been amended, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1, 3-11, 13-26 and 28-36 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

## RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, item 6, the Examiner states in the second full paragraph "applied references have been fully addressed by the examiner as either being fully disclosed or **obvious** in view of the teachings of Silverbrook." **[Emphasis added]** The prior Office Action of March 3, 2006, only presented the applicant with a 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection. In the present Office Action, the Examiner re-asserts the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection. In light of the Examiner's response, the applicant seeks clarification as to whether the rejection is based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) where an anticipation standard is applied and/or based on 35 U.S.C. § 103 where an obviousness standard is applied.

## REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-26 and 28-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Silverbrook, U.S. Patent No. 6,959,298 (hereinafter called Silverbrook). Silverbrook discusses a method of inputting data from a mapped form ("netpage") using a netpage pen into a computerized travel system. In contrast, the present claims are directed to a system for inputting data for a group into electronic insurance forms.

Silverbrook at column 47, lines 27-28 states "[t]he name and description of a customer 501 derives from the details of the corresponding netpage user 800." Silverbrook discusses the inputting of customer information from "netpage." Silverbrook does not teach the customer information inputted is for "a representative customer." Nor, does Silverbrook teach that the "representative customer" is a member of a group. Further, Silverbrook teaches away from inputting based on common attributes of a group by specifying separate input devices for inputting attributes for each member of a family("group").

A household may have a collection of colored netpage pens, one assigned to each member of the family. This allows each user to maintain a distinct profile with respect to a netpage publication server or application server. (See column 9 lines 34-38)

Therefore, Silverbrook as cited or found does not teach or suggest "inputting the personal data of a representative customer of the group as first registration data," as in amended claim 11.

Further, as Silverbrook does not teach inputting personal data that is common to the group for a first registrant, it therefore does not teach or suggest “inputting the common personal data of the remaining customers of the group using part of said first registration data which part is common to the group,” as in amended claim 11.

Further, as Silverbrook discusses each user using “colored netpage pens, one assigned to each member of the family” it does not teach the use of a common input device for all customer and therefore does not teach or suggest “the name of each of the remaining customers of the group is to be input as second registration data via an input device common to all customers,” as in amended claim 11. Support for the amendment found on page 18 lines 12-26 of the application.

For the reasons stated above, claim 11 and the claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinguishable from Silverbrook. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

As to claim 14, as Silverbrook does not teach “remaining customers of the group” of claim 11, it therefore does not teach or suggest “wherein the part of said first registration data is input as part of the personal data of the remaining customers of the group in response to the instructions of an input assisting actuator associated with the display of the apparatus.” Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 9, 23, 26, 34 and 36 recite “via an input device common to all customers.” Therefore, claims 1, 9, 23, 26, 34 and 36 and the claims dependent therefrom are distinguishable from Silverbrook.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

## **SUMMARY**

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102. It is also submitted that claims 1, 3-11, 13-26 and 28-36 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 18, 2007

By: /James J. Livingston, Jr./  
James J. Livingston, Jr.  
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501